

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are active in this case, Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 9-20 having been amended by the present amendment; Claim 21 is newly added. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,444, hereinafter Jain) in view of Mehrotra et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,717, hereinafter Mehrotra); Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra and further in view of Morgenstern (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,490); Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra and further in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,215, hereinafter Takeda); Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra and further in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,970); Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra further in view of Lee and further in view of Morgenstern; Claims 9 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra and further in view of Motoyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,948, herein Motoyama); and Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra further in view of Motoyama and further in view of Takeda.

In response to the rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claim 17 has been amended to clarify the claimed invention. No new matter is added. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claim 21 recites a meta-data registration method including at least the distinguishing features of amended Claim 1 and including further patentable subject matter not disclosed or suggested by any of the references of record. Support for New Claim 21 is found in Applicant's specification at least at page 19 line 27 to page 20 line 25. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this claim.

Briefly recapitulating, a meta-data registration method as in amended Claim 1, includes the following:

"detecting at least one of a MIME format and a data name extension of registering data to be registered into a Web server that registers and manages data and meta-data for data;

selecting one procedure corresponding to the MIME format or the extension detected by the detecting step, from a plurality of procedures each provided in correspondence to at least one of a MIME format and an extension and stored in advance, each procedure having a program code for generating the meta-data for data according to a corresponding MIME format or extension;

generating the meta-data for the registering data by executing the program code of said one procedure selected by the selecting step; and

registering the meta-data generated by the generating step in relation to the registering data into the Web server." (emphasis added)

Thus, the meta-data registration method as in amended Claim 1 detects at least one of a MIME format and a data name extension, selects a procedure from a plurality of procedures stored in advance which correspond to at least one of a MIME format and a data name extension, and then the selected procedure generates meta data which is registered into a Web server.

As noted in the outstanding Office Action, Jain discloses an audio feature extractor that detects the class of an incoming audio signal.¹ Jain detects the class of the audio signal and then a feature extractor may use the full text of a transcription of the audio signal or key words from the transcription of the audio signal as meta-data.² Jain does not teach or suggest

¹ Office Action mailed December 31, 2003, page 3 11-12.

² Jain, column 10, lines 1-27.

the meta-data registration method as recited in Claim 1 which includes “detecting at least one of a MIME format and a data name extension of registering data” or “selecting one procedure corresponding to the MIME format or the extension detected by the detecting step, from a plurality of procedures” stored in advance. Likewise, Jain does not teach or suggest features of amended independent Claims 13, 16, 17, and 20 which correspond to the distinguishing features of Claim 1.

Mehrotra discloses a system and method for storing and retrieving images from an indexed image database using open space meta-data automatically generated by a processor, but does not cure the deficiencies as discussed above with respect to Jain. Further, Mehrotra does not teach or suggest a Web server that registers and manages the data and the meta-data for data as recited in amended Claim 1, or the corresponding Web server of Claims 13, 16, 17, and 20.

Therefore, as neither Jain nor Mehrotra, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of Claims 1, 13, 16, 17, and 20, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Further, regarding amended independent Claims 16 and 20, Jain discloses a “Vidsync” process responsible for responding to start and stop commands from the Video Cataloger, but does not teach or suggest a request processing unit configured to receive and process a registration request for registering data and a first computer readable program code for causing said computer to receive and process a registration request for registering data.³

In view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion dependent Claims 2, 4, 5, 14, 15, 18, and 19 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn.

³ Jain, column 5, lines 14-25.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra and further in view of Morgenstern, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Morgenstern does not cure the deficiencies in the primary references as explained above, and therefore Claim 3 is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claims 1 and 2 from which it depends.

In response to the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra and further in view of Takeda, that rejection is overcome. Takeda does not cure the deficiencies in the primary references as explained above. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra and further in view of Lee, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Lee does not cure the deficiencies in the primary references as explained above. Therefore, Claim 7 is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1 from which it depends.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra further in view of Lee and further in view of Morgenstern, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither Lee nor Morgenstern, either alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies of the primary references Jain and Mehrotra. Therefore, dependent Claim 8 is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1.

In response to the rejection of Claims 9 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra and further in view of Motoyama, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Motoyama does not cure the deficiencies in the primary references as explained above.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Mehrotra further in view of Motoyama and further in view

Application No. 09/532,535
Reply to Office Action of December 31, 2003

of Takeda, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither Motoyam nor Takeda, either alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies in the primary references of Jain and Mehrotra as discussed above.

In view of the apparent patentability of amended independent Claims 1, 13, 16, 17, and 20 for the reasons above noted, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-12, 14, 15, 18, and 19 which depend from Claims 1, 13, 16, 17, and 20 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Dec 29, 09⁰

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

I:\ATTY\SAE\PROSECUTION\0039-7646\0039-7646.AMT.DOC